



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,486	01/13/2006	Hyo-Kun Son	3449-0567PUS1	9185
2292 7590 04/20/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER MIYOSHI, JESSE Y				
ART UNIT 2811		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/20/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/564,486

**Applicant(s)**

SON, HY0-KUN

**Examiner**

JESSE Y. MIYOSHI

**Art Unit**

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 34, 36-44 and 46-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33, 34, 36-44 and 46-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/27/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 3, filed 1/7/2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 33, 34, 36-44, and 46-50 under 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. PGPub 2003/0006418 to Emerson et al., U.S. 5,684,309 to McIntosh et al. and U.S. PGPub 2002/0175341 to Biwa et al.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 33, 34, 36-44, 46-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emerson et al. (U.S. PGPub 2003/0006418; hereinafter "Emerson") as evidenced by McIntosh et al. (U.S. 5,684,309; hereinafter "McIntosh") and Biwa et al. (U.S. PGPub 2002/0175341; hereinafter "Biwa").

**Re claim 33:** Emerson teaches (e.g. figure 1) a light emitting diode (LED), comprising: a first gallium nitride layer (**14**); an  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (**16**) formed over the first gallium nitride layer (**14**); an active layer (**18**) formed over the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (**16**); and a second gallium nitride layer (**32**) formed over

the active layer (**18**); wherein the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (**16**) has a plurality of pits formed thereon.

In the remarks, it is clarified by the Applicant that the steps required for pit formation is by the growth of the multi-layer at different temperatures for each layer comprising the multi-layer and the removal of  $\text{H}_2$  during the growth process (page 3, lines 9-10).

It is taught by Emerson at paragraph [0049] that the indium content in each of the layers comprising the superlattice structure **16** are **not equal**. Additionally, at paragraph [0051] that the superlattice structure **16** is grown in an atmosphere of nitrogen. Emerson does not explicitly specify that each layer is grown at a different temperature.

Biwa discusses the dependence that Indium content of  $\text{InGaN}$  has on temperature having the relationship of  $T=(1080-4.27X)$ , where  $X$  denotes  $\text{In}$  content(%) discussed in paragraph [0015]. For example, 10-20%  $\text{In}$  content would have a growth temperature of 700-800°C whereas  $\text{GaN}$  is higher than 1000°C. Therefore, different growth temperatures result in differing  $\text{In}$  content in  $\text{InGaN}$  materials.

Therefore, the superlattice structure **16** of Emerson having alternating layers of  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}$  and  $\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  where  $X \neq Y$ , would require each layer to be grown at a different temperature.

**Re claim 34:** Emerson teaches the LED wherein the active layer (**18**) comprises an  $\text{InGaN}/\text{InGaN}$  structure of a multi-quantum well structure (**18**, multi quantum well structure; e.g. paragraph 52).

**Re claim 36:** Emerson teaches the device wherein the number of the pits is 50 or less per area of  $5\mu\text{m} \times 5\mu\text{m}$ . The formed pits are a result of the composition of the structure as disclosed in claim 33, therefore, since the structure recited in the prior art is substantially identical to that of the claim, claimed properties are presumed to be present. See MPEP 2112.01(i).

**Re claim 37:** Emerson teaches the LED wherein the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer is formed to have a super lattice structure (superlattice structure **16**).

**Re claim 38:** Emerson teaches the LED wherein each layer of the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer has a thickness of 1-3000Å (superlattice **16** have layers of about 5-40 angstrom; e.g. paragraph 49).

**Re claim 39:** Emerson teaches the device wherein the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer has a photoluminescence characteristic of a yellow band intensity/N-doped GaN intensity ratio of 0.4 or below. Since the structure recited in the prior art is substantially identical to that of the claim, claimed properties are presumed to be present. See MPEP 2112.01(i).

**Re claim 40:** Emerson teaches the active layer (**18**) being directly formed on the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (**16**).

**Re claim 41:** Emerson teaches the LED wherein the LED is blue LED (visible spectrum; e.g. paragraph 3).

**Re claim 42:** Emerson teaches (e.g. figure 1) a method for manufacturing a light emitting device, the method comprising the steps of: forming an N-type gallium nitride layer (**14**); forming an  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (**16**) above the N-type gallium

nitride layer (14), the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (16) including layers of first and second growth temperatures (superlattice structure 16 having alternating layers of  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}$  and  $\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  where  $X \neq Y$ , would require each layer to be grown at a different temperature, reasons for different temperatures discussed below; e.g. paragraph 49); forming an active layer (18) above the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (16); and forming a P-type gallium nitride layer (32) above the active layer (18), wherein the active layer (18) is grown at a temperature lower than the first and second temperatures (superlattice structure 16 exceeds the bandgap of the quantum well layers 120, reasons for active layer growth temperature being below first and second temperatures will be discussed below; e.g. paragraph 61); and wherein the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (16) has a plurality of pits formed thereon (as discussed above for claim 33, pits are present since the layers are grown at different temperatures in an atmosphere of nitrogen).

McIntosh at figure 10 shows that bandgap is greatest at GaN and the least when there is a highest Indium concentration in InGaN. Therefore, the higher the In content in InGaN, the lower the bandgap.

Biwa discusses the dependence that Indium content of InGaN has on temperature having the relationship of  $T=(1080-4.27X)$ , where X denotes In content(%) discussed in paragraph [0015]. For example, 10-20% In content would have a growth temperature of 700-800°C whereas GaN is higher than 1000°C. Therefore, the lower the growth temperatures the higher In content present in InGaN materials.

As Emerson states at paragraph [0061], the quantum well layer **120** of the MQW structure **18** has a lower bandgap than that of the superlattice structure **16**. A lower bandgap InGa<sub>N</sub> material has higher Indium content, therefore, by the evidence of Biwa, quantum well layer **120** was grown at a lower temperature that would result in the higher Indium content of layer **120**.

**Re claim 43:** Emerson teaches the method wherein the active layer is grown at 600~800 °C (temperature is dropped 200°C below 700-900°C; e.g. paragraph 59).

**Re claim 44:** Emerson teaches the method wherein the active layer comprises an InGa<sub>N</sub>/InGa<sub>N</sub> structure of a multi-quantum well structure (**125**, InGa<sub>N</sub> quantum well and barrier layers; e.g. paragraph 57).

**Re claim 46:** Emerson teaches the device wherein the number of the pits is 50 or less per area of 5µm X 5µm. The formed pits are a result of the method of making structure as disclosed in claim 42, therefore, since the structure recited in the prior art is formed substantially identical to that of the claim, claimed properties are presumed to be inherent. See MPEP 2112.01(i).

**Re claim 47:** Emerson teaches the method wherein the In<sub>x</sub>Ga<sub>1-x</sub>N/In<sub>y</sub>Ga<sub>1-y</sub>N multi-layer is formed to have a super lattice structure (superlattice structure **16**).

**Re claim 48:** Emerson teaches the method wherein each layer of the In<sub>x</sub>Ga<sub>1-x</sub>N/In<sub>y</sub>Ga<sub>1-y</sub>N multi-layer has a thickness of 1-3000Å (superlattice **16** have layers of about 5-40 angstrom; e.g. paragraph 49).

**Re claim 49:** Emerson teaches the device wherein the In<sub>x</sub>Ga<sub>1-x</sub>N/In<sub>y</sub>Ga<sub>1-y</sub>N multi-layer has a photoluminescence characteristic of a yellow band intensity/N-doped Ga<sub>N</sub>

Art Unit: 2811

intensity ratio of 0.4 or below. Since the structure recited in the prior art is substantially identical to that of the claim, claimed properties are presumed to be inherent. See MPEP 2112.01(i).

**Re claim 50:** Emerson teaches the active layer (18) being directly formed on the  $\text{In}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{N}/\text{In}_y\text{Ga}_{1-y}\text{N}$  multi-layer (16).

### ***Conclusion***

4. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSE Y. MIYOSHI whose telephone number is (571)270-1629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM EST. Alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne A. Gurley can be reached on (571) 272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2811

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lynne A. Gurley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2811

/Jesse Miyoshi/